

The Regular Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Chamberlain at 7:30 P.M. on Tuesday, August 13, 2002, in the Council Chambers of the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

Present:

Starr  
Vleck  
Kramer  
Storrs  
Pennington  
Chamberlain

Absent

Littman  
Wright  
Waller

Also Present:

Mark Miller, Planning Director  
Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney  
Brent Savident, Principal Planner

Moved by Pennington

Seconded by Starr

RESOLVED, that Mr. Littman, Mr. Wright and Mr. Waller be excused from attendance at this meeting.

Yeas

All Present (6)

Absent

Littman  
Wright  
Waller

MOTION CARRIED

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments

**TABLED ITEM**

3. SITE PLAN REVISION (SP-870) – Troy Professional Building, Proposed Office Bldg., West side of Dequindre, South of Wattles, Section 24 – O-1

Mr. Miller presented a summary of the Planning Department report for the Troy Professional Building.

Mr. Chamberlain commented about cross access to the south and to the north on this property and asked if it is where we match up with the property to the south and the north on their cross access.

Mr. Miller replied, yes it lines up.

Mr. Kramer asked if there were any further requirements.

Mr. Miller replied there are no additional requirements.

Thomas Phillips, 705 Ulrich, Dexter, MI, stated he represents Harry and Sunny Kwon. He had nothing to add to the presentation.

**RESOLUTION**

Moved by Vleck

Seconded by Storrs

RESOLVED, that Preliminary Site Plan Approval, as requested for the Troy Professional Building, Proposed Office Building, located on the west side of Dequindre Road and south of Wattles Road, located within Section 24 and the O-1 zoning district and being 1.06 acres in size is hereby granted.

Yeas:  
All present (6)

Nays:

Absent:  
Littman  
Wright  
Waller

**SUBDIVISIONS**

4. PRELIMINARY PLAT – TENTATIVE APPROVAL – The Estates at Cambridge – East side of Beach, North of Wattles – Section 18 – R-1B

Mr. Miller presented a summary of the Planning Department report for the Estates at Cambridge proposed subdivision.

Mr. Chamberlain asked, with the alternate plan, how far west would the City be looking at Prestwick. Would it come down by lot #4?

Mr. Miller stated that Prestwick would extend and then turn into Carrington Court and would not extend all the way to Beach, so there would be an indirect connection. We would like to see a future connection to that area but further south from the stub street if it is developed some time in the future.

Mr. Storrs asked, the detention pond retaining wall required along the northern line, is that still necessary if this revised plan is used?

Mr. Miller replied that the petitioner is here and he can answer any of your questions.

Mr. Starr stated, we suspect there's a regulated wetlands on there, they would, typically, have to mitigate?

Mr. Miller replied, most likely, yes, but it's hard to say at this time.

Mr. Joseph Cracchiolo, 4881 Riverchase Drive, stated that he is the developer and that a cul-de-sac is the way they would like to go. We got a notice last Thursday that the City of Troy wanted a change in the plans because they wanted a stub street to the south and a stub street to the north. I don't understand why.

Mr. Starr asked, regarding wetlands, do you have any idea on how you want to mitigate them?

Mr. Cracchiolo replied, I am leaving that up to my wetlands consultant.

Mr. Starr asked, do you expect any alteration in the plan because of mitigation?

Mr. Cracchiolo replied, no.

Mr. Storrs asked, what do you know about the wall around the detention pond?

Mr. William Soderberg, 42802 Mound, Sterling Heights, the surveyor, stated that the exact shape and size of the detention pond will be part of final engineering.

Mr. Storrs asked, do you think you it will be necessary that you have one?

Mr. Soderberg replied, we have been doing some research and there are alternatives.

Ms. Pennington asked, the way the property lays, as far as the detention pond, the highest level is where the street is coming in off of Beach, and then it flows down into the detention pond, is that how it's going to lay?

Mr. Sodeberg replied, correct.

Richard Beltz, 2422 Kingsbury, stated that he was familiar with the paving of Beach Road. It was designed to maintain its character and to keep it safe. He stated it has occurred to him that there have been objectives that should have been included in the Ordinance long before this time. We have read about other developments that may be forthcoming down the road. We are asking that this item be tabled. We need more answers. Please say yes to good quality development. Insure that the quality of our neighborhood is protected. Come up with some fair objectives that everybody can agree with.

Mr. Joe Chehayeb, 755 W. Big Beaver, stated that you would have to extend the Prestwick stub street in order to connect to Beach Road. If this were to happen, because of its affects on setbacks and right-of-ways, this would require that a variance be granted from the City in case the stub street is extended.

Mr. Storrs asked if there is a right-of-way dedicated along your property now.

Mr. Chehayeb replied, no

Dale Young, 4255 Beach Road, stated that his house is in the flood plain twenty (20) feet off of the Rouge. The most critical issues deal with the watershed. The wetland has been grossly underestimated and needs to be investigated further before this plan is approved.

Kyle Jones, 4280 Wentworth, stated that the Planning Department created an alternative plat which includes the potential future connection of Prestwick and that there was no advance warning of this. He stated that potential impacts to those on Wentworth would be pretty big and also the other homeowners who live on Beach Road.

Oakley Lutes, 4140 Beach Road, stated he is the adjacent owner on the south end of the proposed development. My concern is the abutting proposal. The proposal by the developer proposes three (3) lots that would abut my property and I would much prefer that to having a dead end street come within about ten (10) feet of my house.

Najih Bahure, 4245 Wentworth, stated he bought his house on the corner of Wentworth and Prestwick and did so because of it being on a dead end street. In checking all documents prior to purchasing my home, I found no encumbrances that Prestwick would possibly be extended to Beach Road. There are several homeowners that object to the extension of Prestwick for the following reasons: 1)

value of the property for current residents will decrease; 2) increased traffic in the neighborhood brings increased risk for children; 3) two outlets will lessen security in the neighborhood and may encourage crime; 4) this would also increase drag racing. This search led to no legal documentation ever being recorded citing the extension of Prestwick to Beach Road, and I believe that neither the Planning Commission nor City Council has the right to approve this plan.

Gail Brush, 4386 Beach Road, just north of the proposed development and stated that the Rouge River runs in her backyard. My main concern is the water problem.

Francis Siefert, 2550 Topsham Rochester, stated that he thought this transaction should be moved forward as soon as possible.

Colleen Gillen, 2461 Kingsbury Drive, stated that her house has flooded twice. The main issue is the water problem and flooding. The river goes wild when there is a hard rain. The river is in my backyard.

Curtis Rouley, 4133 Wentworth, stated that there is a storm drain behind his house that the City did not have a record of, although the City has been out to work on it. The sump pumps pump into a catch basin at the corner of my property and it does need some repair work on it and I believe and that is what contributes to some of the water problems which we are currently discussing.

Rusty Ziter, 4228 Wentworth, stated when they moved to Wentworth, a key factor for their move was that it was a safe street to raise their children. There was no outlet on Wentworth.

Ms. Lancaster stated that what is before the Commission tonight is what's known as a review under our Subdivision Ordinance which is part of the Zoning Ordinance and that the State gives the City a chance to make sure the subdivision is keeping within the design standards of the City. The review of subdivisions is controlled by the State of Michigan and the Troy Subdivision Control Ordinance. If the plans submitted by the builder meet the requirements, it must be approved.

Mr. Kramer stated that this is the first time this Board has seen this plat and asked Mr. Miller what would be the series of steps before there would be final approval.

Mr. Miller stated this is a tentative preliminary plat application. The Planning Commission then makes a recommendation to City Council, who can either approve or deny the tentative preliminary plat as submitted. The tentative preliminary plat sets the layout of lot sizes, where the roads will be, how large the roads are, and the basic foot print of the sizes. Once City Council grants approval the property owner has his engineers design the site; that means the infrastructure, access, paving, and stormwater detention basin. That is submitted to the City engineers for review. There are a number of other reviewing organizations that come in to play, i.e., the MDEQ for wetland delineation and permit, the Oakland County Drain Commission,

etc. The owner would then identify where all the easements will be. This information would be reviewed by these organizations, assembled and then resubmitted to the Planning Department where a Final Preliminary Plat Application is submitted directly to City Council. Construction of the project begins when City Council grants approval of the Final Preliminary Plat. Once the project is initiated and under construction, the Final Plat is submitted and that is the legal document which sets the layout of the subdivision. That is approved by City Council and then signed off by a number of other agencies and eventually submitted to the State for recording and approval.

Mr. Chamberlain stated he likes the original development proposal with the cul-de-sac with cross-access or public walkway to Prestwick and would like to see the detention pond area be a retention pond area. He stated he was in favor of moving this on tonight.

Mr. Vleck suggested a recommendation for the petitioner to seek a sidewalk variance along Beach Road.

Mr. Miller stated before recommending a variance of the sidewalk, he cautioned that a prudent alternative should be looked at to see if it could fit and maintain the character before it's fully waived. Let's see if it can fit and reduce impact. That is his recommendation.

Mr. Starr stated that on Prestwick Drive there is a stub there for some reason and asked if there was anything on record regarding developments to the north and to the south.

Mr. Miller stated the only reason the stub was there was for potential connection to Beach Road and the development of Beach Road properties. The only development that I am currently aware of is the one on Beach Road that is in front of you this evening.

Mr. Storrs stated, that he agrees with going with the developer's option; however, he believed it would be prudent to not only maintain an easement for foot traffic, but maintain an easement for potential continuation of Carrington. He would like to see a typical cross-section of the abutting properties, where it shows a blend.

Mr. Kramer stated there are a couple of different situations relative to the properties to the north and south. He asked Mr. Miller if he understood what the consolidation potential of that property to the north is.

Mr. Miller replied that Choice Group does own a larger area of that property and it is unusually shaped and there really is not that much potential for consolidation.

Mr. Storrs stated that his concern is that we have discussed so many things tonight, that it seems like it would be prudent to table this for a month and let them work these questions to see where we are. For example, will a retention pond work?

Mr. Chamberlain stated that gets back to the engineering that needs to be done after we and City Council approve this. That engineering cannot be started until we approve and City Council approves.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Vleck

Seconded by Pennington

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission recommends to City Council, that the Tentative Preliminary Plat, cul-de-sac version, as requested for The Estates at Cambridge Subdivision, including 10 lots, located on the east side of Beach Road and north of Wattles Road, within Section 18, and the R-1B zoning district be granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. That a paved access drive to the stormwater detention or retention pond shall be provided, as per City of Troy Development Standards.
2. That prudent alternatives be considered in the location of the Beach Road sidewalk. The design should not destroy the natural characteristics of the Beach Road parkway.
3. That a 12 foot wide public walkway be provided for pedestrian traffic to Prestwick Drive.
4. That the current detention pond be changed to a retention pond according to the proposed draft #4 of the Stormwater Detention Standards of the Development Standards currently being developed.
5. That there be an increase in landscaping along Beach Road to maintain the natural character of the road.
6. That the plans show the typical cross-sections on the north, south and east; whereas, it shows the grade blending between this property and the abutting property.

Yeas:

Storrs  
Chamberlain  
Kramer  
Pennington  
Vleck

Nays:

Starr

Absent:

Littman  
Wright  
Waller

Mr. Starr stated his concerns on what the impact may be to the north and south.

MOTION CARRIED

5. PRELIMINARY PLAT – TENTATIVE APPROVAL – Evanswood Parc – North of Square Lake, West side of Evanswood – Section 1 – R-1D

Mr. Miller presented a summary of the Planning Department report for Evanswood Parc Subdivision.

The Petitioner, Bill Mosher, 47745 Van Dyke, Shelby Twp., came forward and stated he had nothing to add to Mr. Miller's summary.

Mr. Storrs asked, what plans do you have to blend the property? Did your client do Meadowcreek also?

Mr. Mosher replied, no.

Mr. Storrs stated that when you dig the basement, sometimes there is extra dirt, then it gets shoved over and someone ends up in a hole.

Mr. Mosher stated that in this instance the lots are large enough that we'll be able to disperse the soil on each individual lot.

Chuck Grigg, 6154 Evandswood Road, stated that this subdivision was inconsistent with the existing terrain and believes this is of higher density than the surrounding area. He also stated that the construction traffic is not safe for the pedestrians on the road including children using the school bus and that he is opposed to any sidewalks that may be proposed for this area. He feels that this is one of the few remaining areas that has rural characteristics. He also asked, why is there so much public comment allowed when the Planning Commission's decisions are based on whether or not the proposed development, based on the tentative preliminary plat, meets the City Ordinance standards for building?

Mr. Chamberlain stated that on a project of this nature a public hearing is not part of the process and we do not have to allow anyone but the petitioner and myself to speak. However, we do allow the public to come up and state their concerns and add their comments. These comments become a part of the public record and are frequently discussed at study sessions. As far as this project, if they meet the Ordinance requirements and the State law, there's not much we can do about it.

Mr. Grigg asked how far are we going to go as far as undeveloped land?



Mr. Chamberlain stated that for privately owned land, the answer is zero. With privately owned property, the owner has a right to develop it as long as it meets the requirements and the State law.

Linda Wattereit, 6205 Evanswood, stated her concern was how much dirt was going to be brought in to raise the level of the land before these six (6) new houses are going to be put in. My experience is that when Meadowcreek was put in, the level of the land was raised four (4) or five (5) feet, leaving the neighbor to the south of her living in a hole. I am afraid I am going to get flooded out.

Mr. Storrs stated that he noticed how low that house is, was dirt hauled in to Meadowcreek?

Ms. Wattereit replied, yes. One truck load after another.

Mary Bogush, 5916 Patterson Drive, asked if they were going to be required to do a tree preservation plan?

Mr. Chamberlain stated that a tree preservation plan has been submitted and approved.

Ms. Bogush asked that consideration be given to working with the natural features of the site. People pay more for lots that still have trees and more natural features remaining.

Ms. Pennington commented about subdivision to the south, Meadow Lark Drive and asked if there was a sidewalk going on Evanswood, and that in regards to that subdivision, would it connect with that sidewalk?

Mr. Miller stated that it would have been required. He didn't know if the sidewalk had been waived, however, it was required.

Mr. Storrs stated that the engineering design for this project needs to be improved.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he would like to see a tree buffer on the west side of that development on the school district property to keep the invasive flowers from overtaking the area.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Storrs

Seconded by Vleck

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission recommends to City Council, that the Preliminary Plat – Tentative Approval, as requested for Evanswood Parc Subdivision, including 6 lots, located north of Square Lake Road and on the west side of Evanswood Road, within Section 1 and the R-1D zoning district be granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. That cross-sections be added to the plat to show the matching and blending of grades to the northwest and south abutting properties.
2. That a rear yard drain system be added along the north side of the property line to be stopped fifty (50) feet from the west property line, the north and east quadrant.
3. That the west forty (40) feet of the subject property cannot be disturbed with any root cuts or overfill.

Yeas:

All present (6)

Nays:

Absent:

Littman  
Wright  
Waller

MOTION CARRIED

### **STREET VACATION REQUEST**

6. PUBLIC HEARING – STREET VACATION REQUEST (SV-15) – Hartland Street, Abutting Outlots A & B of Supervisor's Plat of Beaver Run Subdivision No. 1 (for Proposed West Oak Sub. 1 & 2), North of Big Beaver, East of Daley, Section 23 – R-1E

Mr. Miller presented a summary of the Planning Department report for the street vacation request.

Public hearing opened and closed.

#### **RESOLUTION**

Moved by Kramer

Seconded by Starr

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission hereby recommends to the City Council that the street vacation request for the 60 feet wide and 1,469 feet in

length right-of-way, extending east from Daley Street, abutting Outlots A and B, Supervisor's Plat of Beaver Run Subdivision No 1, located within Section 23, be approved, subject to the dedication of the relocated Hartland Street.

Yeas:  
All present (6)

Nays:

Absent:  
Littman  
Wright  
Waller

### **REZONING PROPOSAL**

7. **PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED REZONING (Z-682)** – John's Market Parking Lot Expansion (Krell Property), North side of Square Lake, East of Livernois, Section 3 – R-1B to P-1

Mr. Savidant presented a summary of the Planning Department report for John's Market Parking Lot Expansion.

Mr. Vleck stated that the current parking at John's Market has only about six (6) spaces, maybe eight (8) and I'm assuming that it is not within our standards right now?

Mr. Savidant stated that he didn't know. He stated he has visited the site and there seems to be a parking problem.

Mr. Storrs stated I don't believe the property immediately north of this requested rezoning is already in the low-rise office classification. That's still R-1B.

Mr. Miller stated that he believed that was correct, directly north is R-1B.

Mr. Storrs stated that he was concerned with the properties on the south side and Square Lake Road, and questioned the ownership pattern on the south side.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that a church sits there at this time and the City currently owns that.

Mr. Storrs stated we should ask ourselves a question as to how does the north side relate to the south side and how do we think it ought to look.

Mr. Kramer stated I am assuming that if this was to be developed as a parking lot, we would see this as a site plan?

Mr. Savidant replied, yes.

Mr. Vleck stated that one point of concern is if we recommend this, does the Petitioner plan on adding on to the building and, therefore, reducing their parking again? Are there any future plans to expand upon the building?

Mr. Shuwayhat, Petitioner, stated he had no additional comments to add to the summary presented, and stated there are no plans for any future additions to the building.

Mr. Miller stated that the petitioner's main concern has been to resolve the parking issues. In addition, in that parking lot will be a historic easement, which will allow for Historic District Commission signage in the parking lot area.

Public hearing opened.

Patricia LaRue, 95 Cutting, Troy, asked if we are looking at taking a smaller eyesore and making it into a larger eyesore. What assurances are the residents going to have that the property owner is going to maintain a newer, larger parking lot, when, in my opinion, he has not properly maintained the old one?

Public hearing closed.

Mr. Chamberlain asked the petitioner that if the rezoning was approved would the dumpster remain on the west side of the building?

Mr. Shuwayhat replied, yes.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Pennington

Seconded by Starr

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission hereby recommends to the City Council that the R-1B to P-1 rezoning request located on the north side of Square Lake Road and east of Livernois Road in Section 3, being 0.24 acres in size, be granted.

Yeas:

Starr  
Kramer  
Pennington  
Chamberlain

Nays:

Vleck  
Storrs

Absent:

Littman  
Wright  
Waller

Mr. Storrs stated that the Future Land Use Plan shows local service in the other three (3) quadrants and there should be no increase in non-residential zoning. This rezoning will not in and of itself damage it. It encourages rezoning on the south side and also additional office zoning north of that.

Mr. Vleck stated that it was inconsistent with the surrounding residential zoning.

MOTION CARRIED

### **SITE PLANS**

8. SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP-864) – Minnesota Spec Building, Proposed Industrial Bldg., East side of Minnesota, North of Fourteen Mile, Section 36 – M-1

Mr. Savidant presented a summary of the Planning Department report for the Minnesota Spec Building Proposed Industrial Building.

Tom Kemp, 275 W. Girard, Madison Heights, Petitioner, stated he had no additional comments to add to Mr. Savidant's summary.

RESOLUTION

Moved by Starr

Seconded by Storrs

RESOLVED, that Preliminary Site Plan Approval, as requested for the Minnesota Spec Building, located on the east side of Minnesota Road and north of Fourteen Mile Road, located within Section 36 and the M-1 zoning, is hereby granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. That all exterior lighting is to be oriented downwards with light sources not visible from abutting properties.
2. That the height of the dumpster enclosure is to exceed the height of the dumpster itself.

Yeas:

All present (6)

Nays:

Absent:

Littman  
Wright  
Waller

MOTION CARRIED

9. SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP-883) – Proposed Medical Office Bldg., Southeast Corner of Livernois and South Blvd., Section 3 – Consent Judgment

Mr. Savidant presented a summary on the proposed Medical Office Building, Consent Judgment.

Jim Barnas, 403 E. Grand River, Brighton, MI, stated that he had no additional comments to add to Mr. Savidant's summary.

No public comments.

RESOLUTION

Moved by Kramer

Seconded by Vleck

RESOLVED, that Preliminary Site Plan Approval, pursuant to a consent judgment, for a proposed Medical Office Building, located on the southeast corner of South Boulevard and Livernois Road within section 3, within the O-1 zoning district, is hereby recommended for approval to City Council, subject to the following conditions:

1. The dumpster in the southeast corner of the parcel shall be screened by a dumpster enclosure. The enclosure shall be a solid wall of at least six (6) feet high on 3 sides, of suitable height to screen the dumpster, and gated.
2. A five foot (5') foot wide striped barrier-free pedestrian crossing shall be provided across the entry drive north of the building, to link the sidewalks on both sides of the entry drive.
3. The acceleration lane on Livernois Avenue shall be eliminated.
4. The left/center lane on both Livernois Avenue and South Boulevard shall be extended as per the City Transportation Engineer.
5. The 23 proposed parallel parking spaces may be landbanked. The parking spaces shall be constructed in the future at the request of the City of Troy, based on a need for spaces on the property.
6. That the brick faced screen wall be brick faced on both sides.
7. That the screen wall will not change the water flow from the properties to the south.

Yeas:  
All present (6)

Nays:

Absent:  
Littman  
Wright  
Waller

10. SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP-679) – Troy Museum, Addition of Historic Church and Parsonage and Parking Lot Expansion, North side of Wattles, West of Livernois, Section 16 – C-F

Mr. Savidant presented a summary of the Planning Department report for the Troy Museum, Addition of Historic Church and Parsonage and Parking Lot Expansion.

Mr. Chamberlain went over a letter received from Mr. Lin regarding an alternate plan and discussed several concerns. He asked Ms. Lancaster, the Assistant City Attorney, what exactly could be done with this proposal?

Ms. Lancaster stated that she reviewed this with Ms. Bluhm, the City Attorney, and that for the record, and in making it clear to the Planning Commission, this letter was submitted by Mr. Lin as a citizen, even though he makes reference to the Historic District Commission. Like any board, this Commission works through its resolutions and motions and there has been no action taken on this plan by that Board. Anything from the Historic District Commission would have to be delivered to you in a resolution or some type of motion in the minutes, to clarify that they made their decision as a Board. This is not being presented to you by the Historic District Commission as a resolution or a motion, but by Mr. Lin as a citizen, who happens to be on the Commission. It is also her understanding that the way the Ordinance reads, that even though the Planning Commission has input into this, it is a site plan approval, it is going to be up to Council to do the final site plan approval. You may take action tonight and make whatever your recommendations are based upon the information you have before you. It will just be that, a recommendation. Then Council will proceed from there.

Mr. Gerald Yurk, 101 Main St., Rochester, stated we were retained by the City to develop the plan for the relocation of the church and parsonage for the museum site and have prepared the plan that is before you now. We do not take any exception with the presentation you received and will be more than happy to answer your questions.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the City Planning Department and other City Staff members took exception to the east part proposed parking lot and its layout where you had a circle of parking as opposed to row parking. Would you comment as to why you proposed circle parking as opposed to row parking?

Mr. Yurk stated that the parking for this site has evolved through several different schemes. We got input from the City Engineering Department based on a more

circular pattern and we reflected that in our more recent submission to the Planning Department. The Planning Department's response was to go to the more linear plan. We submitted an alternate plan showing the linear parking lot layout. We believe either plan will work and will accept either layout. We stayed with the circular plan because it does give us two (2) more spaces on the location.

Mr. Storrs asked how often do you need all of the parking? What if you didn't put that lot in at all?

Mr. Stoutenburg stated that school groups come by bus or by caravan. If they come by caravan, it loads the existing parking lot up. We do need extra parking anyway.

Mr. Storrs asked what about considering grass parking pavers?

Mr. Chamberlain asked if the church could be moved as requested by Mr. Lin. The only problem I see may be the power lines are in the way.

Mr. Stoutenburg stated that another issue is that we plan to place a barn on this site in the future. The parsonage is not going to act just as a parsonage but also as a farmhouse that relates to the barn. The barn is northeast of the parsonage.

Mr. Yurk stated that there were three (3) reasons why they positioned the church and the parsonage like they did:

1. Historically, the church and the parsonage have a relationship to each other in their present location: side by side.
2. There is a substantial cost to moving the power line and we are unable to build under it.
3. The barns; we are trying to preserve some site to the north and east for the barns in the future.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he would like to see on the Commission's proposal to City Council is the Planning Department's recommendation on the proposed parking ,as opposed to what's on this current site plan.

Mr. Vleck stated that in the northeast, there is a proposed detention, but there is absolutely no detail regarding it. What's to be expected there?

Mr. Yurk stated that the civil engineering being done for this particular site is being done by the City's Engineering Department. They have the drawings that show the



detention pond. The reason it is not on the drawing in front of you tonight is because it is not an Engineering drawing.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Pennington

Seconded by Starr

RESOLVED, that Preliminary Site Plan Approval, pursuant to Section 18.80.00 (B), as requested by the City of Troy, for the Troy Museum, Addition of Historic Church and Parsonage and Parking Lot Expansion, located on the north side of Wattles Road and west of Livernois Road, Section 16, within the C-F Community Facilities zoning district, is hereby recommended for approval to City Council, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the Planning Commission recommends the alternate parking lot design from the Planning Department on the east proposed parking.
2. That the exit sign on Wattle's road be move to the east side of the driveway.

Yeas:

Storrs  
Chamberlain  
Vleck  
Starr  
Pennington

Nays:

Kramer

Absent:

Littman  
Wright  
Waller

Mr. Kramer stated that the architect's proposal has two (2) additional parking spaces and the potential for two (2) more when the Sycamore dies.

## MOTION CARRIED

11. SITE PLAN REVISION (SP-827) – National TV Book, Revised dumpster location and parking lot, North side of Park, East of Livernois, Section 34 – M-1

Mr. Savidant presented a summary of the Planning Department report for the revised dumpster location and parking lot.

Mr. Stephen Lucla, 209 Park St., petitioner, stated he had no additional comments to add to Mr. Savidant's summary.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if the debris had been cleared.

Mr. Lucila stated, no it hasn't; however, it will be gone by the end of the month.

Mr. Starr asked if you clear away the dumpster enclosure, what will keep the dumpsters from roaming?

Mr. Lucila stated we are going to enclose the dumpster between the buildings with a fence.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Storrs

Seconded by Kramer

RESOLVED, that Preliminary Site Plan Approval, as requested for the National TV Book – Revised Dumpster Location and Parking Lot, located on the north side of Park Road and east of Livernois Road, Section 34, located within the M-1 zoning, is hereby granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. Relocate one of the three handicap parking places on the west side of the northerly lot adjacent to Building A.
2. That the building should be cleared of all junk and debris before the end of the month.

Yeas:

All present (6)

Nays:

Absent:

Littman  
Wright  
Waller

## MOTION CARRIED

12. SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP-761) – Republic Bank, Proposed Bank (former Bill Knapp's Restaurant), South side of Big Beaver, East of John R, Section 25 – B-3

Mr. Savidant presented a summary of the Planning Department report for the Proposed Republic Bank.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Storrs

Seconded by Starr

RESOLVED, that Preliminary Site Plan Approval, as requested for the Republic Bank (former Bill Knapp's), located on the south side of Big Beaver Road and east of John R Road, Section 25, located within the B-3 zoning district, is hereby granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the existing cross access easement be shown on the Site Plan and clarify that it allows through traffic from Big Beaver to the easement which runs east and west side of the property and further south to the southern property line.
2. That no luminaries or hot spots for lighting will be visible from the adjacent properties.
3. Provide a twenty-four (24) foot wide cross-access easement from the cross-access easement connection with the White Castle property in a counter-clockwise direction to the existing cross-access easement that runs east and west across the property.

Yeas:

Chamberlain  
Vleck  
Starr  
Kramer  
Storrs  
Pennington

Nays:Absent:

Littman  
Wright  
Waller

MOTION CARRIED

### **ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT**

13. **PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT**  
**(ZOTA 193)** – Article XXXIX (39.00.00) Environmental Provisions - Walls

Mr. Savidant presented a summary of the Planning Department report for the proposed amendment.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that this text amendment mandates, in wooded areas and areas of special concern, that walls will not be constructed with footings. That they will be elevated walls to allow water to go under them and prevent the destruction of the tree roots and trees if they're going through a wooded area; and that they've got to be compatible with the adjacent residential sites. This only applies to parcels adjacent to residential areas. We are trying to save trees and we are trying to save water. In essence, that's what we've got here.

Public hearing opened and closed.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Kramer

Seconded by Starr

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission hereby recommends to the City Council that the ARTICLE XXXIX of the Environmental Provisions Ordinance to read as follows:

Amend the indicated portions of the Environmental Provisions in the text to read as follows:

(Underlining, except for major section titles, denotes changes.)

### **39.00.00 ARTICLE XXXIX ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS**

#### 39.10.00 WALLS:

39.10.01 For those use districts and uses listed below there shall be provided and maintained on those sides abutting or adjacent to a residential District a brick wall ~~an obscuring wall~~ as required below:

	<u>District/Use</u>	<u>Requirements</u>
(A)	P-1 Vehicular Parking District	4'-6" high wall
(B)	Off-street parking areas in residential Districts and C-F Districts	4'-6" high wall
(C)	B-1, B-2, B-3, H-S, O-1, O-M, O-S-C, R-C and M-1	6'-0" high wall
(D)	E-P Districts, when such are a part of a non-residential development site involving Non-Residential Zoning Districts.	4'-6" high wall
(E)	M-1 Districts - open storage area	6'-0" to 8'-0" high wall. See Article XXVIII, Section 28.25.02 and 28.30.04

- (F) Hospital ambulance and delivery areas 6'-0" high wall

(Rev. 10-7-96)

- 39.10.02 Required walls shall be located on the lot line except where underground utilities or natural features, as determined by the Planning Commission, interfere and except in instances where this chapter requires conformance with front and yard setback lines in abutting residential districts. The location of such walls may further be revised where, in the opinion of the Planning Commission, such relocation will as effectively or more effectively serve the intended screening or obscuring function.

(Rev. 6-29-92)

- 39.10.03 Such walls and screening barriers shall have no openings for vehicular traffic or other purposes, except as otherwise provided in this chapter ~~and except such openings as may be approved by the Chief Building Inspector or the City Engineer.~~ All walls herein required shall be constructed of common or face brick on both sides ~~or of poured or precast masonry or decorative block the designs of which shall be approved by the Chief Building Inspector and shall be compatible with the adjacent residential site.~~ Pillar supported wall structures shall be required when trench footings or construction of such walls would alter the original grade at the lot or property line and would impede the stormwater drainage flow from the original pre-construction storm water drainage flow or cause damage to existing trees or the root structure of existing trees.

be approved.

Yeas:  
Vleck  
Starr  
Kramer  
Storrs  
Pennington  
Chamberlain

Nays:

Absent:  
Littman  
Wright  
Waller

MOTION CARRIED

ADJOURN

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Miller AICP/PCP  
Planning Director